

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 19, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-13 are all the claims that are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 12 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application, the Applicants have provided amendments to the specification and abstract. The changes to the specification and the abstract include minor editorial and clarifying changes. A new abstract is enclosed on a separate sheet. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the specification and the abstract.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner objects to claims 1 and 9 based on minor informalities. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that the claim recites the phrase "display contents into one" in line 10, which is confusing. Additionally, with regard to claim 9, the Examiner alleges that the term "LSI" renders the claim indefinite because there is no explanation of its meaning.

Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to clarify the meaning of the claims. Specifically, the phrase "display contents into one" in claim 1 has been deleted. Additionally the meaning of LSI has been added to claim 9. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner rejects claims 1-10 because the claims refer to a "display device" without indicating if the display device is a physical device or a virtual screen. With regard to claim 12, the Examiner alleges that the claim is directed to a program itself which is *per se* non-statutory. Finally, with regard to claim 13, the Examiner states that the claim is directed to an LSI and is unclear whether the LSI is a physical device.

With regard to claim 1-10, the Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the display device is part of a terminal device as shown in Fig. 3 of the Applicants' disclosure. The display device is now clearly directed to a physical device, not a virtual screen. With regard to claim 12, the Applicants have amended the claim to recite that the program is stored on a computer-readable medium for causing a computer to execute the steps recited in the guidance display method according to claim 11. As amended, claim 12 is now believed to be directed to statutory subject matter. With regard to claim 13, the Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the LSI is a large scale integrated circuit implemented as a guidance display device. Thus, the LSI of claim 12 is now clearly directed to a physical device. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 10-12 been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,571, hereafter "Ikeda"). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites the following features that are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art:

“[a] guidance display device on a terminal device for guiding a user's operation, the guidance display device comprising:

a content display unit operable to display respective contents on corresponding display regions which are included in one screen and are to be operated by the user;

a guidance content holding unit operable to hold, in advance, for each of the display regions, a guidance display content for guiding the user's operation of a display region;

a guidance synthesis unit operable to obtain, from said guidance content holding unit, the guidance display contents respectively corresponding to the display regions, and to synthesize the obtained guidance display contents; and

a guidance display unit operable to display, on a guidance region included in the screen, which is different from the display regions, the guidance display contents synthesized by said guidance synthesis unit.”

The features noted above in claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 11.

Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants disclosure (e.g., Fig. 4).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Ikeda for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in claims 1 and 11. However, the Applicants maintain that Ikeda fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 11 (as amended).

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the map information data receiving unit 24 and the map information server 21 in Ikeda correspond to the guidance content holding unit of the present invention. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that the route specifying unit 25 in Ikeda corresponds to the guidance synthesizing unit of the present invention; and the map display unit 27 in Ikeda corresponds to the guidance display unit of the present invention.

However, the Applicants point out that the guidance display device and method, as recited respectively in claims 1 and 11, is clearly different from the features noted above in Ikeda. Specifically, the display device of the present invention includes a content display unit that displays respective content on corresponding display regions include in one screen. No such feature is believed to be disclosed or suggested in Ikeda.

Further, the guidance content holding unit of the present invention holds, in advance, for each of the display regions, a guidance display content for guiding a user's operation of the display region. Each of the display regions displays content and is subject to operation by a user. On the other hand, the map information data receiving unit 24 and the map information server 21 in Ikeda merely hold maps or routes, and do not hold guidance display content for guiding the user's operation of the respective display regions, wherein the display regions display content and are operated by the user. Thus, the map information data receiving unit 24 and the map information server 21 in Ikeda are completely different from the guidance content holding unit and method recited respectively in independent claims 1 and 11.

Additionally, the guidance synthesis unit of the present invention synthesizes the guidance display content corresponding to the user's operation of the respective display regions. Conversely, the route specifying unit 25 in Ikeda synthesizes map or routes and does not synthesize guidance display content corresponding to a user's operation of respective display

regions. Thus, the guidance synthesis unit and method recited respectively in independent claims 1 and 11 are also completely different from the route specifying unit 25 in Ikeda.

Finally, the guidance display unit and method recited respectively in claims 1 and 11 displays the synthesized guidance display content on a guidance region which is different from the display regions. On the other hand, the map displaying unit 27 in Ikeda merely displays synthesized maps or routes and does not display the above-describe synthesized guidance display content on a guidance region which is different from a display region.

In summary, the present invention is directed to synthesized guidance display content for guiding a user's operation of content displayed on respective display regions, wherein the synthesized guidance display content is displayed on a region which is different from the display regions. On the other hand, Ikeda merely discloses synthesizing and displaying maps or routes, and does not disclose or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1 and 11 (as amended).

Based on the above discussion, the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 11) is not anticipated or render obvious by Ikeda. Additionally, claims 2-6, 10 and 12 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ikeda at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claims 1 and 11.

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Burgess (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,790, hereafter "Burgess").

Claims 7 and 9 depend from independent claim 1. As noted above, Ikeda fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in independent claim 1 (as amended). Additionally, Burgess fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Ikeda. Therefore, no combination in Ikeda and Burgess would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 7 and 9 at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda. Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1. As noted above, Ikeda fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, no modification in Ikeda would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claim 8 at least by virtue of

its dependency from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Endo (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,493, hereafter “Endo”). The Applicants have amended independent claim 13 to help further distinguish the claim from the cited prior art. Specifically, independent claim 13 has been amended to recite similar features of independent claims 1 and 11 (as amended). Specifically, claim 13 has been amended to recite that following features that are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

“[a] large scale integrated (LSI) circuit implemented as a guidance display device for guiding a user’s operation, the LSI comprising, in an integrated manner, the following:

- a content display unit operable to display respective contents on corresponding display regions which are included in one screen and are to be operated by the user;

- a guidance content holding unit operable to hold, in advance, for each of the display regions, a guidance display content for guiding the user’s operation of a display region;

- a guidance synthesis unit operable to obtain, from the guidance content holding unit, the guidance display contents respectively corresponding to the display regions, and to synthesize the obtained guidance display contents; and

- a guidance display unit operable to display, on a guidance region included in the screen, which is different from the display regions, the guidance display contents synthesized by said guidance synthesis unit.”

Similar to independent claims 1 and 11, the above features of independent claim 13 are fully support by the Applicants disclosure (e.g., Fig. 4 and Fig. 3).

As amended, independent claim 13 is believed to be distinguishable over Ikeda for similar reasons noted above for independent claims 1 and 11. Additionally, after a detailed review of Endo, the reference fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Ikeda. Therefore, no combination in Ikeda and Endo would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claim 13 (as amended).

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action date March 19, 2008, and pass the application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideaki YAJIMA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.06.18 16:38:12 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 18, 2008